Remarks/Arguments

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Goddard (U.S. Patent No. 6,684,240 B1), in view of Haraoka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,898,801 B1), hereinafter referred to as "Haraoka".

The claims have been amended to clarify their correspondence to Figures 2 and 4 and the description on pages 7-8 of the Specification.

It is respectfully asserted that neither Goddard nor Haraoka, alone or in combination, disclose the step of:

> "responsive to detecting user selection of said option to display another rating sample, repeating, for another rating sample, at least said steps of accessing a rating sample, enabling reproduction of the rating sample, and detecting a user input indicating the acceptability of the rating sample,"

as described in currently amended claim 1.

Goddard does not disclose the use of a rating sample database in the receiver system. Furthermore, Goddard does not describe an iterative training process wherein the user is presented with an option, after assessment of a rating sample, as to whether the user wishes to evaluate an additional sample. Therefore, Goddard fails to disclose "responsive to detecting user selection of said option to display another rating sample, repeating, for another rating sample, at least said steps of accessing a rating sample, enabling reproduction of the rating sample, and detecting a user input indicating the acceptability of the rating sample," as described in claim 1. Furthermore, Goddard would fail to provide the significant advantage of the present invention of allowing a control system to be set up via pre-stored rating samples without the need to wait for desirable and undesirable content to be broadcast.

Like Goddard, Haraoka does not describe an iterative training process wherein the user is presented with an option, after assessment of a rating sample, as to whether the user wishes to evaluate an additional sample. Haraoka also fails to describe the storage of specific television rating samples in a database of a receiving system or the detection of user input regarding the acceptability of a sample accessed from that database. Therefore, Haraoka, like Goddard, fails to disclose "responsive to detecting user selection of said option to display another rating sample, repeating, for another rating sample, at least said steps of accessing a rating sample, enabling reproduction of the rating sample, and detecting a user input indicating the acceptability of the rating sample," as described in claim 1.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that there is no 35 USC 112 enabling disclosure provided by Goddard or Haraoka, that makes the present invention as claimed in currently amended claim 1 unpatentable. It is further submitted that currently amended independent claims 7 and 13 are allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable. Since dependent claims 2-6, 8-12, and 14-18 are dependent from allowable independent claims, it is submitted that they too are allowable for at least the same reasons that their respective independent claims are allowable. Thus, it is further respectfully submitted that this rejection has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's representative at (609) 734-6804, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian J. Cromarty/

By: Brian J. Cromarty
Reg. No. 64018
Phone (609) 734-6804

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
March 1, 2010